

EB 41

Relations with Designated Operational
and Applicant Entities

DOEs Regional Calibration Meetings – defined dates

□ China

- Beijing – 29 September
- Hosted by DNV

□ Latin America

- Sao Paulo – 27 October
- Hosted by Bureau Veritas Certification

Elaboration of CDM Accreditation Requirements

- ❑ Workshop held in Bonn on 7th July
- ❑ Inputs sent separately by DNV, SGS, BV and TUV-Rheinland
- ❑ Main expectation
 - CDM Accreditation Standard aligned to ISO/IEC 17021:2006 – Conformity Assessment – Requirements for bodies providing audit and certification of management systems

Seriousness of CDM consideration

- DOEs implement own rule to assess seriousness of CDM consideration (Carbon Finance 09/07/2008)
 - One of the major reasons for a rejection of a CDM project by the CDM Executive Board is that the project fails to provide sufficient evidence that the benefits of the CDM were seriously considered by the project developer before the start of the project.
 - In order to address this, major DOEs (SGS, DNV, TUV Süd, TUV Rheinland) are now implementing a new approach. This approach was agreed in the last DOE forum meeting held in April 2008. DOEs agreed that a good indicator for the seriousness of CDM consideration is the time gap between start of the project and submission of a project for validation. This time gap should not be more than 12 months. The same requirement is already enforced by the Voluntary Carbon Standard.

Seriousness of CDM consideration (cont.)

- As of July the following conditions have to be met for a project to be accepted for validation:
 - Within 12 months after start date of the project, the Project Participant (or an entity nominated by the PP to do so) has to either:
 - - submit project for validation to a DOE (using an approved methodology); or
 - - submit a new methodology for approval by the EB via a DOE; or
 - - submit letter to a DOE that the project is waiting for approval of a new Methodology.
- If the above is not followed, it is assumed that the CDM was not seriously considered and the project is not really depending on the CDM benefits in its implementation.
- The following exception applies: A project that has started implementation can be considered for validation, if it had to be stopped because of a change in financing conditions and was not able to secure new financing (without CDM) for a period of 12 months.

Seriousness of CDM consideration (cont.)

- ❑ This subject was, indeed, discussed during the last Forum meeting
- ❑ DOEs agree that action must be taken to stop reviews and rejections based on seriousness of CDM consideration
- ❑ DOEs agree that good indicator of seriousness of CDM consideration is a maximum period of 12 months from the start of the project and its submission for validation

Seriousness of CDM consideration (cont.)

- However, this approach of not accepting projects that do not fill this 12 months criteria is not a Forum decision
- DOEs are “polarized” between 2 approaches
 - Not accepting projects
 - Accepting but apply a stricter evaluation and, if it is the case, issue a negative validation statement

Pending issues

- ❑ Starting date of the project activities – Input to EB37
- ❑ Approval of already operational project activities – Input to EB37
- ❑ Affidavit by top management of Project Participants – Input to EB37
- ❑ Liability of DOEs in Programme of Activities – Input to EB39
- ❑ Contractual arrangement between PP and DOE – Input to EB40

Next interactions with the Board and the secretariat

- EB 42
- DOE/AIE regional calibration meeting - Beijing

Thank you!